1	Steve W. Berman (pro hac vice)	Jeffrey L. Kessler (pro hac vice)
	Emilee N. Sisco (pro hac vice)	David G. Feher (pro hac vice)
2	Stephanie Verdoia (pro hac vice)	David L. Greenspan (pro hac vice)
3	Meredith Simons (SBN 320229)	Adam I. Dale (pro hac vice)
]	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP	Sarah L. Viebrock (pro hac vice)
4	1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000	WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
	Seattle, WA 98101	200 Park Avenue
5	Telephone: (206) 623-7292	New York, NY 10166-4193
_	steve@hbsslaw.com	Telephone: (212) 294-6700
6	emilees@hbsslaw.com	jkessler@winston.com
7	stephaniev@hbsslaw.com	dfeher@winston.com
	merediths@hbsslaw.com	dgreenspan@winston.com
8		aidale@winston.com
	Benjamin J. Siegel (SBN 256260)	sviebrock@winston.com
9	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP	
10	715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 300	Jeanifer E. Parsigian (SBN 289001)
10	Berkeley, CA 94710	WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
11	Telephone: (510) 725-3000	101 California Street, 34th Floor
	bens@hbsslaw.com	San Francisco, CA 94111
12		Telephone: (415) 591-1000
13	Class Counsel for Plaintiffs	jparsigian@winston.com
14	[Additional counsel on signature page]	Class Counsel for Plaintiffs
15		
	UNITED STATES D	
16	NORTHERN DISTRIC	
17	OAKLAND	DIVISION
17	IN RE COLLEGE ATHLETE NIL	Case No. 4:20-cv-03919-CW
18	LITIGATION	Case 110. 4.20-cv-03919-c W
	LITIOATION	PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO
19		INTERESTED PARTY'S OPPOSITION
20		TO ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
20		SHORTEN TIME PURSUANT TO
21		CIVIL LOCAL RULE 6-3 FOR THE
_		HEARING OF PLAINTIFFS'
22		UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR
		PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
23		CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
24		
- '		Hon. Claudia Wilken
25		
,		
26		
27		
28		
- 1		

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this response to the Opposition to Plaintiffs' Unopposed Administrative Motion to Shorten Time Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3 for the Hearing on Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Settlement Approval of Class Action Settlement (ECF No. 454).

In Plaintiffs' motion, Class Counsel explained that there is good reason to advance the hearing date because it would allow the parties to begin as soon as possible the process of identifying contact information for the approximately 250,000 potential class members who will receive notice of the proposed settlement. Defendants did not oppose this request as the parties both recognize that the notice process will be time consuming and cannot begin until preliminary approval is granted. To give just one example of the problems with delay, Defendants' member institutions are waiting to notify class members under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA") statute until after the Court grants preliminary approval and prior to providing any contact information to Plaintiffs. Thus, a longer delay until the hearing will result in a longer delay until Plaintiffs will be able to gather the data they need to initiate the proposed notice program.

Fontenot counsel argue that the hearing date for preliminary approval in *In re College Athlete NIL Litigation* should not be moved because they want more time to "scrutinize the proposed settlement" and "determine whether a response is called for" prior to the hearing. As an initial matter, to the extent the *Fontenot* lawyers have publicly stated their intention to oppose the settlement in this case in an effort to keep their own, overlapping case alive and to pursue some "better" form of relief, that is not a proper basis on which to object. In overruling similar objections, the Ninth Circuit has noted, "Settlement is the offspring of compromise; the question we address is not whether the final product could be prettier, smarter or snazzier, but whether it is fair, adequate and free from collusion." Moreover, it is not necessary for the *Fontenot* plaintiffs to file any response before the preliminary approval hearing or to otherwise participate in the hearing,

¹ Fontenot counsel have not opposed Plaintiffs' motion to advance the preliminary approval hearing date in the Hubbard case.

² See i.e., KESSLER DEFENDS HOUSE V. NCAA DEAL AMID FONTENOT CASE FLAK, Sportico.com (May 22, 2024), https://www.sportico.com/leagues/college-sports/2024/kessler-house-ncaa-deal-fontenot-1234780034/.

³ Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011, 1027 (9th Cir. 1998).

Case 4:20-cv-03919-CW Document 456 Filed 08/02/24 Page 3 of 5

in order to ensure that their interests are protected. If the Court grants preliminary approval, the Fontenot plaintiffs—and all other members of the proposed settlement classes—will receive notice and will have plenty of time to "scrutinize" the settlement (and file objections if they so choose) prior to final approval. Advancing the date of the preliminary approval hearing would not in any way impair the Fontenot plaintiffs' rights, but it would delay the efforts the parties here are undertaking to ensure that all members of the proposed classes receive notice and have a fair opportunity to be heard. Based on these facts, as well as those set forth in detail in Class Plaintiffs' Motion, Plaintiffs

respectfully ask the Court to set the hearing at the earliest date convenient to the Court.

2	By <u>/s/ Steve W. Berman</u>	By <u>/s/ Jeffrey L. Kessler</u>
	Steve W. Berman (pro hac vice)	Jeffrey L. Kessler (pro hac vice)
3	Emilee N. Sisco (pro hac vice)	David G. Feher (pro hac vice)
4	Stephanie Verdoia (pro hac vice)	David L. Greenspan (pro hac vice)
4	Meredith Simons (SBN 320229)	Adam I. Dale (pro hac vice)
5	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP	Sarah L. Viebrock (pro hac vice)
	1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000	Neha Vyas (<i>pro hac vice</i>)
6	Seattle, WA 98101	WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
7	Telephone: (206) 623-7292	200 Park Avenue
7	Facsimile: (206) 623-0594	New York, NY 10166-4193
8	steve@hbsslaw.com	Telephone: (212) 294-6700
	emilees@hbsslaw.com	Facsimile: (212) 294-4700
9	stephaniev@hbsslaw.com	jkessler@winston.com
10	merediths@hbsslaw.com	dfeher@winston.com
10		dgreenspan@winston.com
11	Benjamin J. Siegel (SBN 256260)	aidale@winston.com
	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP	sviebrock@winston.com
12	715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 300	nvyas@winston.com
12	Berkeley, CA 94710	I 'C E B ' ' (GD) (200001)
13	Telephone: (510) 725-3000	Jeanifer E. Parsigian (SBN 289001)
14	Facsimile: (510) 725-3001	Drew H. Washington (SBN 350107) WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
	bens@hbsslaw.com	
15	Jeffrey L. Kodroff (<i>pro hac vice</i>)	101 California Street, 34th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111
16	Eugene A. Spector (pro hac vice)	Telephone: (415) 591-1000
16	SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, PC	Facsimile: (415) 591-1400
17	2001 Market Street, Suite 3420	jparsigian@winston.com
	Philadelphia, PA 19103	dwashington@winston.com
18	Telephone: (215) 496-0300	
19	Facsimile: (215) 496-6611	Class Counsel for Plaintiffs
19	jkodroff@srkattorneys.com	
20	espector@srkattorneys.com	
21	Class Counsel for Plaintiffs	
22	J 33	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	-3-	

1	ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1(i)(3)		
2	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), the filer of this document attests that concurrence in		
3	the filing of this document has been obtained from the signatories above.		
4	/ / G		
5	/s/ Steve W. Berman STEVE W. BERMAN		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23 24			
24 25			
25 26			
20 27			
28			
_0	-4-		
- 1			

PLS. RESP. TO OPP'N TO UNOPPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE MOT. TO SHORTEN TIME